

Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 STATE 089949

10

ORIGIN EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 IO-10 OIC-02 CIAE-00 PM-03 INR-07 L-02

ACDA-05 NSAE-00 PA-01 PRS-01 SP-02 USIA-06 TRSE-00

SAJ-01 SS-15 NSC-05 /073 R

DRAFTED BY OASD/ISA:JTYLER

APPROVED BY EUR/RPM:GBHELMAN

OASD/ISA:MGMCAULIFFE

OASD/PAANDE:MR. WOODS

PM/ISP:JGRAHAM

EUR/RPM:COLTHOMPSON

JCS/J-5:BGYOUREE (INFO)

----- 087803

R 182337Z APR 75

FM SECSTATE WASHDC

TO USMISSION NATO

INFO USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

CINCLANT

USLOSACLANT

OFFICE OF PREPAREDNESS/GSA

C O N F I D E N T I A L STATE 089949

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: MPOL, NATO

SUBJECT: MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE

REF: A) USNATO 2057, B) USNATO 2047, C) USNATO 2116

1. WHILE WE FIND GENERAL THRUST AND COVERAGE OF 4TH
REVISION OF DRAFT GUIDANCE ACCEPTABLE, WE HAVE A FEW
POINTS OF CONCERN.

2. THE FIRST POINT OF MAJOR CONCERN IS THE ELIMINATION
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 STATE 089949

OF NATO MOBILIZATION AS A PRIORITY ACTION. NOT ALL NATO

FORCES NEED TO BE AT FULL STRENGTH AT ALL TIMES, NOR CAN NATO NATIONS NECESSARILY AFFORD TO MAINTAIN ALL UNITS AT FULL STRENGTH AT ALL TIMES. FRG UTILIZATION OF ITS TERRITORIAL ARMY AND ROUNDOUT OF ITS STANDING UNITS DEPEND ON RAPID MOBILIZATION. MOBILIZATION IS EQUALLY ESSENTIAL IN OTHER NATO NATIONS. IT SHOULD BE RECOGNIZED CLEARLY WITHIN PARAGRAPH 57 (PRIORITIES).

3. AS A COROLLARY POINT WE BELIEVE THAT STATEMENTS IN DOCUMENT AS WRITTEN CALLING FOR STANDING LAND FORCES

TO BE COMBAT READY (PARA 35 A(1)), AND MARITIME FORCES TO BE HELD AT A HIGH STATE OF READINESS (PARA 35(C)) MAY BE MISCONSTRUED TO MEAN THAT ALL GROUND AND NAVAL UNITS ARE REQUIRED TO BE CATEGORY A IN THE MC 55/2 APPENDIX A CLASSIFICATION. SOME FLEXIBILITY SHOULD BE POSSIBLE IN DETERMINING READINESS OF UNITS, AND SUCH FLEXIBILITY REFLECTED WITHIN PAPER.

4. RE PARA 35(D), ON THEATER NUCLEAR FORCES, IS DRAFT PLACES DEVELOPMENT OF OPTIONS UNDER COMMAND AND CONTROL HEADING. YOU SHOULD SEEK TO BREAK OUT CONTINUED DEVELOPMENT OF OPTIONS AS SEPARATE ITEM, PER STATE 78927.

5. WITH RESPECT TO THE FORMULA FOR RESOURCE ASSUMPTION BY NMA'S (PARA 62), WHEREBY NMA'S WOULD FORWARD PROPOSALS BASED ON CURRENT DEFENSE EFFORTS PLUS A 3-5 PCT ANNUAL INCREASE IN REAL TERMS, WE PREFER EARLIER MISSION FORMULATION THAT FORCE PROPOSALS SHOULD BE RELATED TO ANTICIPATED FUNDING AS INDICATED BY NATIONS WHO HAVE BEEN URGED (PARA 74) TO ALLOW FOR A 3-5 PER CENT ANNUAL INCREASE IN DEFENSE EXPENDITURES IN REAL TERMS. ONLY IN THIS WAY CAN THE HARD CHOICES BE FORCED. WE WOULD ALSO LIKE TO SEE SOME REFERENCE TO LIMITING PRIORITY ONE FORCE IMPROVEMENTS IN PARA 63 AND CLEARER TREATMENT OF THE REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT FORCE PROPOSALS ON A REGIONAL BASIS IN GUIDANCE TO NMA'S (AS PER REFTTEL).

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 STATE 089949

6. WE ARE UNCLEAR AS TO THE UTILITY AND FEASIBILITY OF SOME OF THE STUDIES CALLED FOR IN PARA 78, E.G., "MEANS AVAILABLE TO THE ALLIANCE FOR DETERMINING THE GROWING MARITIME THREAT," AND "THE POSSIBILITY THAT CONFLICTS IN AREAS BORDERING UPON, BUT NOT WITHIN, THE NATO AREA COULD BE EXTENDED SO AS TO AFFECT THE SECURITY OF NATO NATIONS."

---(A) IF THE FIRST TOPIC IS A FORECAST OF PROPOSALS FOR INCREASED MARITIME FLEXIBILITY AS A RESPONSE TO THE GROWING MARITIME THREAT, WE WOULD WELCOME THIS SOLUTION. BUT WE WOULD NOT WELCOME ANY SHIFT OF PRIORITY AWAY FROM MEETING THE NEEDS IN THE INITIAL LAND-AIR CONFLICT.

---(B) THE STUDY ON CONFLICTS IN ADJACENT AREAS WOULD NOT NECESSARILY BE HELPFUL. IF ITS TERMS OF REFERENCE COULD BE CLARIFIED IT MIGHT PROVE USEFUL; OTHERWISE,

IT SHOULD BE DROPPED.

7. WE FIND REQUIREMENT IN LAST SENTENCE PARA 35 (B) CALLING FOR ALL AIRCRAFT TO POSSESS AN ALL-WEATHER CAPABILITY TO BE SOMEWHAT OVERSTATED. ONLY F-4, F-111 AND F-102 WITHIN NATO CURRENTLY MEET THIS CRITERIA. A MORE ATTAINABLE OBJECTIVE SHOULD BE STATED, I.E., EFFORTS SHOULD BE MADE THROUGH COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS TO ATTAIN THE NECESSARY ALL-WEATHER CAPABILITIES.

8. FYI. WE FIND VIGOR AND THRUST OF "GUIDANCE" SECTION (PARAS 60-80) MOST USEFUL. MISSION SHOULD RESIST EFFORT TO WATER IT DOWN. END FYI.

9. ON CONVENTIONAL CAPABILITY, WE HAD HOPED DRAFT GUIDANCE WOULD SUPPORT US VIEW THAT A STALWART CONVENTIONAL CAPABILITY IS NOT BEYOND REACH WITH A GOOD DEAL OF EFFORT. WE RECOGNIZE THAT TREATMENT OF CONVENTIONAL COMPONENT OF NATO TRIAD IN CURRENT DRAFT IS AN IMPROVEMENT OVER HANDLING OF CONVENTIONAL CAPABILITY IN 1973 GUIDANCE, BUT IT STILL REMAINS CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 STATE 089949

SOMEWHAT SHORT OF THE MARK. WOULD APPRECIATE MISSION VIEW ON ALTERNATIVE OF (A) ATTEMPTING TO SECURE IMPROVED LANGUAGE DURING PERMREPS ACTION ON DRAFT OR (B) ACCEPTING CURRENT LANGUAGE WITH INDICATION AT PERMREP AND POSSIBLY MINISTERIAL LEVEL OF US BELIEF THAT FACTS OF CASE WOULD WARRANT ALLOCATION OF A MORE MAJOR ROLE FOR CONVENTIONAL FORCES, BEYOND THAT OF HANDLING A LIMITED CONVENTIONAL ATTACK.

10. OUR VIEWS ON CEP COVERAGE ARE BEING SENT SEPARATELY.

KISSINGER

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: INSTRUCTIONS, MILITARY POLICIES, MEETINGS, EMERGENCY PLANNING, MINISTERIAL MEETINGS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 18 APR 1975
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: MartinML
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975STATE089949
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: JTYLER
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D750138-0213
From: STATE
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t19750436/aaaabhpx.tel
Line Count: 167
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ORIGIN EUR
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 4
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: 75 USNATO 2057, 75 USNATO 2047, 75 USNATO 2116
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: MartinML
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 18 APR 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <18 APR 2003 by BoyleJA>; APPROVED <17 SEP 2003 by MartinML>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
05 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE
TAGS: MPOL, NATO
To: NATO BRUSSELS
Type: TE
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 05 JUL 2006